

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/579,232	POLLET ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
N. EDWARDS	1794	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) N. EDWARDS.

(3) ____.

(2) Jeffery Bousquet (57,771).

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 16 September 2008

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claims of record

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/N Edwards/
 Primary Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was notified of the Langauge Problem with the claims and spec. The claim 1 preamble, for example is not commensurate with the body of the claim. Claim 1 recite a composite yarn but the body of the claim appear to be a composite or island in the sea fiber (US textile Dictionary). In the US a composite yarndo not correspond to the body of claim 1. Note once the yarn filaments are separated and uniformly distributed in a polymer matrixIn claim 1 it is no longer a filament yarn but are filaments or fibers perse in a polymer matrix.